Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME PORTRAITS AT LAMBETH PALACE.

THE visitor at the time-honoured residence of England's Archbishops, as he stands in the noble Guard-chamber, now used as the public Dining-hall, and contemplates the lineaments of that succession of more or less distinguished men who have risen to the primacy, should not forget that besides these there are in other parts of the Palace pictures of historical interest and value scarcely inferior to those which appear in this series. Here, indeed, are a genuine Holbein (Warham), a probable Piombo (Pole), an undoubted Van Dyke (Laud), a Kneller (Tillotson), a Hogarth (Herring) a Sir Joshua (Secker), a Dance (Cornwallis), a Romney (Moore), and others of later date. And, besides these, distributed over the private apartments are also a Gainsborough (Bishop Warren, of Bangor) a Beechey (Bishop Douglas, of Carlisle), a second by Sir Joshua (Bishop Newton, of Bristol), two more by Dance (Bishops Terrick, of London, and Thomas, of Winchester), and several more not unworthy of notice.

But here, again, are to be found other pictures, if of less value as works of Art, yet in no way devoid of historic interest, and it is to some of these we would now draw attention.

Over the mantelpiece in the further drawing-room hangs a painting which may undoubtedly claim precedence on the score of age. It represents the 'Four Fathers of the Western Church,' SS. Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory, grouped in pairs, occupying the foreground, while the dove in a halo of glory is descending and hovering over them, a thin, yet distinct thread of gold, like a ray of light, passing from the dove to the head of each of the four figures. It is painted on oak panel, which clearly marks it to be English work, though its style as clearly connects it with the Flemish school of Art of the fifteenth century. It no doubt originally formed the centre-piece of a triptych. The circumstances under which it first appeared at Lambeth are doubtful. This is one—the only one now remaining—of the three so-called "superstitious pictures" which furnished the ground for a charge of idolatry against Archbishop Laud.* In his defence he explained that he had had no hand in introducing the picture; he had found it in the gallery, where it was reported to have been placed by Cardinal Pole. Apparently on the strength of this statement, Ducarel, and those who have followed him, ascribe the original introduction of the picture to the Lambeth collection to the Cardinal, whereas the language of Laud may only mean that Pole had placed it himself in the gallery which he had recently erected over the cloisters,† not that it came then for the first time to Lambeth. Now it is worthy of notice that while the picture seems to bear an earlier date than the time of Pole, the subject of it would also suggest an earlier connection with the Palace. We read in Dr. Hook's "Life of Archbishop Chichely" that after he had completed the building of All Souls College at Oxford, he consecrated its chapel to the memory of these four saints, or "Latin Fathers." Is it then unreasonable to conjecture—for of course it can be only conjecture—that this picture may have been placed within the walls of the Palace by Chichely after he had reared the noble Tower (erroneously called the Lollards' Tower) which was undoubtedly his erection, and that thus this picture may possess the additional and special interest of being another relic of his refined and pious liberality?

Another picture, which hangs in the private dining-room, also deserves notice, and is worthy of being made the subject of some little historical research; it is beautifully engraved and coloured in Herbert and Brayley's "Lambeth." It is traditionally reputed to be a portrait of Katherine Parr; Ducarel so notes it, but calls it "a singular picture." It is certainly very little like any of the recognised extant portraits of that Queen, either in face, figure, or dress. It is younger and more handsome; there is nothing *petite* about it, an epithet currently applied to Katherine Parr; then the head-dress, high peaked, made of cloth of gold, richly ornamented, seems to belong to the times of the earlier Queens of Henry, whereas Katherine Howard and Katherine Parr are always represented in low, round, close-fitting velvet hoods, or caps of state. All these points seem to suggest the question whether this portrait was ever meant to represent the twice-widowed matron (though only thirty years of age) who consented to be the sixth consort of Henry VIII.

But another question now arises: if not, of whom is it the probable portrait? Passing to the adjoining parish church of Lambeth, we find a brass (engraved in Allen's "Lambeth," p. 116) evidently belonging to the earlier portion of the sixteenth century, which, according to an inscription that formerly existed there, represented a *Katherine Howard*, daughter of Sir John Broughton, of Luddington, Beds, and wife of Lord William Howard, the eldest son of the great Duke, Thomas, of Norfolk, High Treasurer, &c., by his second wife, Agnes, daughter of Hugh Tilney, Esq. This Lord William was afterwards raised to the peerage as Lord Howard of Effingham. Now this brass, in features and head-dress, undoubtedly bears a striking resemblance to the picture in the Palace. This Katherine Howard died in 1535. Katherine Parr was not married to Henry VIII. till 1543, and the entire change in the character of the female head-dress took place during those intervening eight years.

Now this Lady Katherine Howard left an only daughter named Agnes. Lord William married again, and had a second family. When, in 1541-42, he and his wife were involved in the suspicion—which, however groundlessly, attached to every one who bore the name of Howard—of complicity with the misconduct of their ill-fated kinswoman, Lord William and his wife were disgraced and imprisoned for a time, leaving some infant children, four in number, no doubt including the daughter of the former wife. According to Miss Strickland, "the Council were greatly embarrassed what to do with them," as they were "thus rendered homeless," and at last consigned them to the care of Cranmer and others. The charge of one of these children being assigned to the Archbishop, the question suggests itself whether it was not the eldest, the child of the Lady Katherine; and if so, whether it was not more than probable that the portrait of her own mother should pass with the little orphan into Cranmer's charge, and that thus this picture was originally the likeness of the Lady Katherine; and that she, being a comparatively insignificant personage in history, might with the lapse of years have been confounded with a more famous Katherine, an active supporter of the Reformation, which fact suggests to Pennant a reason for the supposed likeness of Katherine Parr being in Lambeth Palace.

May it not be, then, that the reputed, but unlike, portrait of Katherine Parr was really the likeness of the Lady Katherine Howard, who was buried in Lambeth Church, and whose little daughter found a home in Lambeth Palace?

* The other two, as mentioned in the editorial foot-note by H. Wharton in the "History of the Troubles, &c., of Archbishop Laud," were the 'Ecce Homo,' Pilate leading forth Christ and presenting Him to the Jews; and an illustration of the Parable of St. John x. 1, 2, in which the Pope and a party of friars are represented as climbing up to get into the windows and over the walls of the sheepfold. The very spirit of this latter picture should, one would think, have carried its own refutation of the charge of any leaning to Papacy on the part of the Archbishop. Strange to say, all three pictures remained in the gallery, and escaped demolition at the hands of the regicides, Scott and Hardy; but these two have since disappeared, and all traces of them have been long lost.

† Cloisters and gallery were both taken down half a century ago.